

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes.

IS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? YOU BE THE JUDGE OF THAT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is a lot like television's well-known energizer bunny—it keeps going and going—at the expense, of course, of the American taxpayer.

Many politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But so many of these same politicians regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills during the 103d Congress, which perhaps is a primary factor in the new configuration of U.S. Senators.

This is a rather distressing fact as the 104th Congress gets down to business. As of Friday, January 20, 1994, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,796,537,934,595.60, or \$18,207.74 per person.

Mr. President, it is important that all of us monitor, closely and constantly the incredible cost of merely paying the interest on this debt. Last year, the interest on the Federal debt totaled \$190 billion.

Mr. President, my hope is that the 104th Congress can bring under control the outrageous spending that created this outrageous debt. If the party now controlling both Houses of Congress, as a result of the November elections last year, does not do a better job of getting a handle on this enormous debt, the American people are not likely to overlook it in 1996.

A TRIBUTE TO SEATTLE'S BRAVE FIREFIGHTERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, four Seattle firefighters died in the line of duty: Lt. Walter Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, and firefighters Randall Terlicker and James Brown. They are heroes in the truest sense of the word. Jon Gillis, president of the Seattle Firefighters Union, said these four men gave their lives for the noblest of causes, for the safety and protection of others. I join him in that sentiment.

In the midst of this tragedy, the community came together to pay homage to these fallen firefighters. But the pain of this loss extended beyond Seattle: More than 10,000 firefighters, police officers, paramedics, and citizens from across North America and from as far away as Australia, came to Seattle to honor these firefighters.

Too often, we fail to say thank you to these brave men and women who serve us as firefighters, police officers, and members of the Armed Forces. The professions they have chosen are full of risk. Seattle Mayor Norm Rice recently reminded us these guardians of our society play a special role, and, tragically, sometimes pay the ultimate

price for their service. They are extraordinary individuals and make a real difference in our lives and in our communities. They are quiet heroes who deserve our respect, our admiration, and our gratitude.

Their families also share the hardships and pain that come along with these jobs. I know because one of my brothers is a firefighter in Tacoma, WA, and I can tell you the danger inherent in his job is felt by his immediate and extended family. I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank the men and women, and their families, who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities.

I am deeply saddened by the death of these four firefighters, and want to pay tribute to the sacrifice these extraordinary individuals have made. Lt. Walter Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, and firefighters Randall Terlicker and James Brown truly represent what is best about America.

ON THE LIFE OF MARIYAMA DOROTHY COLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to take this opportunity to remark on the life of Mariyama Dorothy Cole, who passed away this month.

Mariyama, a resident of Windsor, was an inspiration and joy to her family and friends. She was Marie to all who knew her. Marie was a girl of unique and distinctive beauty, but it was her inner strength and serenity that were most remarkable.

To understand what made Marie a person so deserving of recognition one must know the awesome changes Marie helped inspire and the incredible perseverance she demonstrated on a daily basis.

Today, because of Marie, children in the State of Connecticut who have complex health care needs of disabilities are better able to live at home with their families. Mariyama and her family challenged existing policies that were contrary to family unification. She was instrumental in the passage of several pieces of legislation that will foster better services for families and children. She was the first child with special needs to attend totally inclusive classes in her hometown high school.

Throughout her 18 years of life, Marie gave more love and educated more people than most individuals do in two lifetimes. Mariyama's determination was mighty; her courage and fortitude fierce; her presence impossible to ignore. She asked for nothing and yet taught her family and friends how to give and share with others the love that overflowed from her.

Marie has left an indelible mark on my State. Thousands of children have already benefitted from Marie's life, and many more will benefit from her legacy.

MEDICAL EMERGENCY FOR SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to inform my colleagues that Senator LEAHY was not present for votes Thursday evening due to a family medical emergency. On behalf of the Senate, I extend our prayers to his entire family and our hopes that he will be able to resume his official duties very soon.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year marks the 30 year anniversary of the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. In 1965 Senator Jacob Javits and I sponsored this legislation to foster the development of excellence in American art and culture. After a long and distinguished history of nurturing the arts in our Nation, the National Endowment for the Arts has in recent years become the subject of some controversy concerning the funding of certain works which many of our citizens consider offensive. In light of this, I would like to explain why I believe that the National Endowment for the Arts has been a tremendous boon to our Nation and should continue as a viable entity for the support of American culture.

Our Nation's Arts Endowment provides critical assistance for cultural works and presentations in music, theater, literature, dance, design arts, and folk arts around the country. This year, in my own State of Rhode Island, the Endowment provided funds to renovate painting and sculpture facilities in the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design, supported an after-school arts education program for minority neighborhood youth in the fourth and fifth grades, and funded the Trinity Repertory Theater, one of the Nation's premier theaters. In other areas, the NEA funded a Music in our Schools program in Providence and aided a folk arts apprenticeship program. Without this funding, Mr. President, many of these programs would simply not exist. In this context, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials from the Providence Journal and others from around the country in support of the National Endowment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 15, 1995]

WE NEED THE NEA

The Newt Congress has cast a cold eye on the National Endowment for the Arts, the federal agency that provides grants to arts organizations and individual artists.

As federal budget items go, the NEA is no behemoth. Its allotment this year is \$167.4 million, nearly \$3 million less than the endowment had to work with a year ago, and an annual outlay of roughly 65 cents for every man, woman and child in America. (When was the last time you could get into

even a neighborhood puppet show at that price?) Compared with governments in most Western European nations, ours expends a pittance on art. And the NEA budget is dwarfed by the \$9 billion Americans give privately to the arts each year.

Yet despite its modest draw on federal revenues, the NEA has for some time been a favorite target of some conservatives, who like to focus on the few projects they consider obscene, and an offense to family values, while ignoring the much greater sums that help keep small orchestras, ballet troupes and less controversial artists going.

In Rhode Island, \$829,700 in NEA money went to 15 artists and arts groups in the fiscal year that ended last September. The bulk went to the Rhode Island Council on the Arts, which distributes support to a variety of projects. Other stipends went to four individual artists (in visual arts, dance, literature and translation), and to such groups as the Rhode Island Philharmonic, Trinity Repertory Theater, RISD, Brown and the Langston Hughes Center for the Arts.

Massachusetts, during the same cycle, garnered 153 grants worth \$4.9 million.

A legitimate philosophical question lies beneath the often vituperative attacks on the NEA. That is, should the federal government play any role at all—however small—in supporting the arts? In an era of deficits and taxpayer discontent, the question has new urgency. Certainly no program should be shielded from a rigorous appraisal of cost-effectiveness; and all agencies must share in overdue federal fiscal discipline.

In the 1960s, when the NEA was conceived, the rationale seemed simple. Most popular forms of entertainment (movies; TV; recordings) paid for themselves. But what about the artistic and cultural experiences that many people had less contact with?

Who would make opera accessible to more than just the wealthy; assure that painters received training and a chance to paint; and help keep classical musicians playing? The government saw a role for itself in nourishing work that might not instantly withstand the judgment of the marketplace but might enrich culture over time.

Minus certain Cold War distortions, the rationale for subsidizing the arts was little different from that for supporting academic and scientific research. Not every American should have to agree with the worth of each individual project; it was the idea that the general category was a good to an advanced society.

But why not imply turn all of this over to the private sector—nonprofit institutions supported by business and individuals? First, such institutions are simply not equipped now to shoulder what for them would be such a heavy transfer of obligation. Many arts organizations would be left foundering during the interim. Additionally, federal arts dollars function as seed money, attracting extra financing from local governments and the private sector. The federal imprimatur lends legitimacy, and helps to guide private involvement. As a result, it is easier for artists and arts groups to raise the money they need than if they had to appeal solely to the private sector.

But finally, a federal arts program has important symbolic value. Merely by existing, it makes a statement about what we as a nation value—in this case, something beyond getting and spending. If values truly are the fundamental crisis in this country, as conservatives suggest, eliminating the NEA would send exactly the wrong message. Congress should spare it.

[From The New York Times, Jan. 13, 1995]

DON'T AX FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ART

The National Endowment for the Arts, now in its 30th year, has been a brilliant though

sometimes controversial success. At a modest cost to the taxpayers, \$167 million this year, it has helped channel private donations to an impressive variety of nonprofit arts institutions across the country. Institutions report that each dollar granted by the Endowment generates an average of \$11 in matching private funds. As a result, many more Americans have been able to experience original art firsthand, and talented artists have been encouraged to pursue their work.

This is just what the Endowment was created to do. But now, for a variety of reasons, some conservative Republicans want to use their new Congressional majorities to cut off funds for the Endowment and shut it down. They should not be allowed to succeed.

The Endowment has some devoted conservative Republican defenders, for example Senators Orrin Hatch and Alan Simpson. But other conservatives remain ideologically opposed to public subsidies for the arts. Yet subsidies by governments and wealthy patrons are an ancient and necessary tradition. Even artists whose greatness has been acknowledged by posterity have had to struggle to support themselves during their lifetimes, particularly if their originality consisted in challenging received tastes. Enlightened societies all over the world recognize that there is a clear public interest in supporting such talents and to sustaining the traditions represented by an museums, libraries, symphonies and dance, opera and theatrical companies and making them available to wider audiences.

This is a wise and historically validated role for governments. The real risk of government subsidies lies not in overgenerous use of the taxpayers' money but in the potential for political interference or censorship. The Endowment's designers wisely guarded against this danger by leaving initial grant-making decisions to panels of people knowledgeable about the arts. The awards are then subject to two higher levels of expert review. Most grants are awarded not to individual artists or productions but to institutions with a good track record. But a good track record in the arts includes a willingness to take the occasional risks on a promising new or controversial talent.

It is these risks that have gotten the Endowment in trouble with demagogic politicians like Jesse Helms who will seize on provocative aspects of particular exhibits or performances put on by institutions receiving some Endowment support to caricature the whole of the Endowment's work. The most recent controversy, for example, centered on a bloodied paper towel flung by a performance artist, Ron Athey, at the Walker Arts Center in Minneapolis. The Endowment had awarded some \$100,000 to the Walker to help support its entire season. The Walker in turn awarded about \$150 of this money to Mr. Athey.

Not all great art is controversial and not all controversial art is great. But themes like eroticism, homosexuality and the provocative use of religious imagery that so upset the Endowment's critics have been entwined with great art for centuries. In recent years, the Endowment has tried to play it safe on these issues to appease its Congressional critics. But excessive caution shortchanges an important part of the Endowment's mission.

The zealous and small-minded are always willing to attack art and artists. But there is no reason to elevate their attacks to general Government policy. To do so would be a distortion of the mandate of the November election. To be blunt about it, prominent New York Republicans with ties to the city's extraordinary cultural institutions have an obligation to see that their more rambunctious

members of Congress do not destroy the National Endowment for the Arts.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 13, 1995]

MAINTAIN SUBSIDIES TO SUPPORT THE ARTS.

American voters say they want a leaner, more effective government. And like most federal programs, the National Endowment for the Arts could survive with less. But it would be a mistake to eliminate the NEA and its \$167 million budget.

Attacking the NEA has become good symbolism for political conservatives. They believe the federal government has no business subsidizing the arts and they object to the choices the NEA makes in choosing which artists to subsidize.

We disagree on both counts. In our view, government can play a legitimate role in subsidizing the arts, and political disagreement over which artists to subsidize is both inevitable and worth it.

By any definition, the arts are important to the nation's quality of life. There is no evidence that self-interested consumers, corporations and foundations can adequately meet funding needs.

Since the NEA was founded in 1965, grants have been awarded to traditional as well as avant-garde artists. These grants often serve as vital seed money for artists, projects and arts organizations. For every \$1 individual artists and groups get from the NEA another \$11 in private donations is raised.

The arts also have positive economic impact. Museums, art galleries and theaters attract tourists and conventions. On an annual basis, the arts generate \$37 billion in revenues, employ 1.3 million people and pay \$3.4 billion in various taxes.

Eliminating federal subsidies also would cripple state and local arts programs which get 35 percent of their funds from the NEA. The Illinois Arts Council for example, will get \$896,000 or 11.7 percent of its \$7.6 million budget, from the NEA.

The world would not come to an end if the NEA were eliminated. But all that would be satisfied are the political aims of today's congressional leadership. In the real world, the federal government is running an annual budget deficit of \$203 billion. Cutting \$167 million for the arts would do much more harm than good.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 13, 1995]

SHUNNING THE YAHOO POINT OF VIEW

(By Raymond Sokolov)

As the new Congress starts to debate whether to zero out the pitifully small (\$176 million) budget of the National Endowment for the Arts, everyone should take a look at the section of "Gulliver's Travels" where Gulliver visits the Houyhnhnms and the Yahoos. The Houyhnhnms are equine intellectuals, the Yahoos hairy, uncouth louts in human form. In our day, while the cultivated Houyhnhnms whinny and prance in futile protest, we are well on the road to becoming a nation of Yahoos.

Christina Jeffrey's appointment as historian of the House of Representatives was a warning. Speaker Gingrich was rewarding her because in 1993 she had supported his attempt to keep his course at Georgia's Kennesaw State College alive while other faculty there were protesting it as improperly contaminated with politics. But Ms. Jeffrey, an associate professor of political science, was not just a complaisant right-winger at a Podunk college. She was already on record in

1986 denouncing a federal history program about genocide because it did not include the Nazi point of view on the Holocaust. When this statement resurfaced a few days ago, Speaker Gingrich said he hadn't connected Ms. Jeffrey with its author because she had used her maiden name back then (before he met her). So, to stem the tidal wave of furious public outrage, he up and canned the lady.

This flaplet raises several interesting questions, but the most interesting is, What kind of intellectual milieu could bring Speaker Gingrich and Ms. Jeffrey into contact as historians?

Wishing to believe in the good faith of all parties, I accept that the speaker did not know about the Nazi memo, that he agrees with the angry protesters, and that the intellectual milieu in Georgia where this odd couple found common cause is exactly the kind of unenlightened backwater in which the Holocaust can be blithely dismissed by a professional historian as a subject primarily of interest for religious discussion (as Ms. Jeffrey argued to the federal government).

Anyone who thinks that way is an unreconstructed anti-Semite, of course, but, worse still, such a person has managed to remain completely untouched by the overwhelming facts of history as they have been documented, discussed and accepted by historians and others in the overwhelming majority of mainstream America and the rest of the world. It is one thing to hate Jews. Any moral dwarf can do that. But it takes an especially ignorant and fact-resistant sort of historian to believe that there is a viable Nazi point of view on the subject.

But let's stop for a moment and try to take Ms. Jeffrey seriously. What would the Nazi point of view on the Holocaust be? Why obviously it would be a positive point of view. Unlike most of us who think the sadistic incineration of six million people because they had at least one Jewish grandparent was among the great crimes of history, the Nazis believed it was a great and necessary achievement. The Nazi point of view must have been that annihilating Jews was a social good for Nazi Germany and the world. And, on reflection, I agree with Ms. Jeffrey that any good course on the dynamics of genocide would have to include this point of view, expressed as vividly as possible with documents and photographs. This is actually the approach that the Holocaust Museum on the Mall in Washington takes, and it is an extremely effective method of discrediting the Nazi point of view.

The trouble with Ms. Jeffrey's point of view about the Nazi point of view is that she thinks the Nazi point of view has real merit worth airing in a classroom. Ms. Jeffrey has obviously not considered the unusual facts of the Nazi record, or she wasn't interested in them. She is therefore a historian outside history. She is a Yahoo.

Does that sound like the harrumph of a member of the cultural elite? I certainly hope so, because I think that the Jeffrey affair obliges people committed to the preservation of our heritage to defend the idea of cultural elitism against the Yahoos. If we who speak for culture retreat from the fray now, we really are an effete corps of impudent snobs, in Spiro Agnew's immortal phrase.

What we should be saying, as the fight for the National Endowment budgets and their survival begins, is that the arts are everybody's province, that their health is a matter of highest national interest.

Speaker Gingrich, no doubt trying to look like a non-Yahoo in an effort to assume presidential stature, recently expressed his admiration for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and for Atlanta Opera. He

should go further, if he wants to shake off the hairy mantle of Georgia Yahoo. He should put his (our) money where his mouth is.

Newt, get down and support the arts. Don't zero out the NEA budget. Increase it manyfold under wise and stringent supervision, to put our cultural heritage in museums, libraries and concert halls on a solid footing for the future. Help America join the rest of the world in making sure that the treasures of the past—and the arts education system that makes that possible—will prosper. Otherwise, we will all be provincial Yahoos with no point of view worth having.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 10, 1995]

MAKING A CASE FOR THE ARTS

Chairwoman Jane Alexander of the National Endowment for the Arts believes House Speaker Newt Gingrich is crusading to abolish her agency—a sandbox for the cultural elite, he calls it—because he doesn't understand how it works.

And so, much in the same manner as first lady Hillary Clinton, Alexander has invited the Georgia Republican to a get-acquainted meeting to answer his questions and, she hopes, to dispel his misgivings.

The opportunity to enlighten is narrowing. The tentative date for hearings on reauthorizing the endowment is Jan. 20, and the 104th Congress is loaded with newcomers eager to cut government spending who look to Gingrich for guidance.

First, Alexander ought to disabuse Gingrich and his following of the misconception that a significant blow can be struck for deficit reduction with the demise of the endowment. As vital as its support is to needy arts groups, its budget—\$167 million or about one ten-thousandth of all federal spending in fiscal '94—is minuscule by comparison with the billions in cuts required to restore fiscal sanity in Washington.

Second, Alexander needs to counter the fiction that the endowment is a plaything of the affluent and the avant-garde. True, some cultural colossi, like New York's Metropolitan Opera, receive funding from the endowment and have enough wealthy patrons that they might be weaned without great sacrifice. True, too, a few experimental artworks funded by the endowment have turned out to be highly offensive, but the chances of recurrences should be minimized thanks to new accountability procedures instituted by Alexander.

The point for Alexander to stress is that if the endowment were terminated, the real victims would be medium-size and smaller arts organizations scattered throughout the country, too little appreciated except in their own back yards. In Gingrich's bailiwick, that would include Marietta's splendid Theatre on the Square and by extension a host of Atlanta assets—the Symphony, the Opera, the Ballet, the Center for Puppetry Arts, the High Museum, the Alliance Theatre and so on.

What these institutions have managed to do ought to be celebrated by the GOP cost-cutters as a triumph of public-private partnerships—leveraging each dollar of endowment funding into \$11 from private and other public sources. They are able to attract that support mainly because recognition by the endowment is widely viewed as a national seal of artistic merit.

There are other good reasons to save the endowment—its youth education mission, its anti-crime programs, even the beneficial economic spinoffs from the arts attractions it supports. But the clincher ought to focus on this generation's legacy to posterity.

John Boehner of Ohio, chairman of the House GOP conference, opposes the endow-

ment because he calls it “living high off the hog and passing on the bills to our kids and grandkids.” But what kind of country will our kids and grandkids inherit if the quality of our serious music, art and drama is diminished and concert halls, theaters and galleries go dark for want of the endowment's precious seed money?

No one disputes that the endowment must maximize its efficiency. But above all, the NEA deserves to survive.

[From the Washington Edition—Los Angeles Times, Jan. 11, 1995]

GOP HAS A SONG FOR NEA: TAPS—SOME CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS SEEK TO ABOLISH FEDERAL ARTS ENDOWMENT

What kind of art should our hard-earned tax dollars go to support, traditional American folk art or sexually explicit avant-garde art? “Neither,” the new Republican majority in the House seems poised to answer. That's a shame.

Two years ago, the arts-funding question was shaped by the scandal of Andres Serrano's “Piss Christ.” Robert Mapplethorpe's homoerotic photographs and Karen Finley's nude performance art, all of which had enjoyed some degree of support from the National Endowment for the Arts. But even though the Supreme Court struck down a “decency clause” that the NEA imposed under pressure, the entire controversy subsided as the federal agency, under the leadership of Jane Alexander, simply exercised better discretion in selecting artworks to endow.

This year, however, the philosophical ground has shifted. The House Republican leadership wants to abolish the NEA on principle. Its claim, a familiar conservative one, is that, in the words of House Majority Leader Dick Arney (R-Tex.), “there is no constitutional authority for this agency to exist.” This year, as a result, federal funding for all art is in equal jeopardy, including funding for such mainstream, old-fashioned arts festivals as “Masters of the Folk Violin” and “Masters of the Steel String Guitar,” both sponsored by the National Council for Traditional Arts.

Plain-folks art does not cost as much money as fancy-folks art. Putting together an evening of “Sacred Harp Singing,” another NCTA effort, or the annual “Cowboy Poetry Gathering” does not cost as much as mounting a great classical ballet. But it doesn't come free, either, and the NEA has spent much of its modest appropriation as seed money: small matching grants and other sensible efforts to help groups like the NCTA, Chicago's Old Town School of Folk Music and Los Angeles' Craft and Folk Art Museum find their way to private support.

The argument that there is no constitutional authority for an educational agency such as the NEA rests on the truth that the Constitution makes no provision for public education of any kind. If from that fact we must infer that there can be no funding for an arts endowment, then there can also be none for a National Endowment for the Humanities, a National Science Foundation or any other federal initiative in higher education.

Arney and the Republican majority can argue against funding the NEA even if the constitutional authority for the agency exists. But if and when they do so, we hope they will not pretend that only a wealthy elite has been served by the NEA, for the opposite is the case. Through the NEA, the spirits of millions of ordinary Americans have been lifted through the traditional craft, song and story of their native land. Those Americans will be spiritually poorer, and the American tradition weaker, if the

budget line of the NEA is spitefully reduced to zero.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 17, 1994]

AMERICA'S ART AND SOUL

Conservatives looking for Government fat to trim say they can't wait to take a cleaver to the National Endowment for the Arts—That naughty, left-wing frill in the federal budget. They should look and think before they chop, because the NEA is hardly a luxury. It's American bedrock, as solid as the summer concerts on the town green, or dance programs at the local high school, or the puppet shows at the community center.

While the NEA has hit the headlines for controversies, most notably the funding for photographer Robert Mapplethorpe, the endowment's primary business is supporting family-oriented entertainment, about which it has received little publicity since it was founded in 1965.

In Boston the NEA money goes to such places as the Handel and Haydn Society, the Berklee College of Music, the Huntington Theater Company, the Boston Ballet, the Chinese Culture Institute, the Boston Center for the Arts and Boston Dance Umbrella, to name a few. The list reflects a national portrait of community involvement and grassroots culture that is as vital to a country's strength as the defense budget or a jobs program.

The NEA's budget is \$167 million—approximately 65 cents for every American. This investment provides 5,000 grants, which put up seed money to be matched by local funding. It also stimulates the economy, for the arts put 3.2 million people to work and provide \$3.4 billion in federal income taxes. According to the NEA one study showed that the arts generated \$37 billion to local businesses around the country.

A wise investment, not only for the psyche but also for the bottom line. Members of Congress eager to wield the axe should consider the real work and economics of the NEA rather than the aberrations that have made news. Since 1965 it has provided 11,000 individual artists with fellowships—42 Pulitzer Prize winners, 47 MacArthur grant recipients and 28 National Book Awards authors. The grants came to people as they were struggling to create their art. A country that fails to encourage this loses its genius and its soul.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I fully understand that many Americans are troubled when they hear of works distasteful to them that are funded in part with their tax dollars. Nevertheless, while the Endowment has awarded well over 100,000 grants, fewer than 40 have resulted in any controversy whatsoever—a success rate of 99.96 percent. Over the last year Chairman Jane Alexander has instituted a series of most valuable changes in the agency's procedures. The agency will no longer accept applications from organizations, other than the State arts councils, which subgrant Endowment funds out to other projects. In addition, the Endowment will now require that progress reports be submitted before the release of the final third of a grant award. Permission from the agency will be necessary before a grantee can modify its activities from those approved by the Endowment. These changes give the chairman greater oversight over Endowment grants and I believe they will go a long way toward addressing the concerns of many of our citizens.

Chairman Jane Alexander has increased the Endowment's focus on rural communities and the inner cities. The Underserved Communities Program grants \$8.7 million specifically to broaden public access to the arts. Even the very limited funds appropriated for the Endowment help keep ticket prices reasonable, thus enabling lower income citizens, young people, the elderly, and the disabled to gain access to our common culture.

Nothing could be further from the truth than the suggestion that support for the arts provided by the National Endowment constitutes a subsidy for the wealthy. One of the primary missions of the Arts Endowment has been to encourage the spread of American culture beyond those individuals, communities, and regions affluent enough to afford it on their own. Uncharacteristically among Federal programs, Endowment dollars multiply and foster national support for the arts. Yearly Endowment grants draw matching grants of approximately \$1.4 billion from private, State, and local patrons. Thus, before the National Endowment for the Arts came into existence, there were only 22 professional theaters in the entire country and 1 million people attended each year. Today, our Nation boasts 420 and 55 million attend. There were 58 orchestras before the agency, today, there are over a 1,000. Fifteen million more Americans attend symphony performances each year.

I think it is rather unfair to our citizens for some individuals to assert that only wealthy Americans are interested in the development of the arts. I firmly believe and the evidence supports the fact that Americans from every walk of life, from every economic level, strongly desire and seek access to cultural events in their communities for themselves and for their children. The National Endowment for the Arts is a testament to the continuing development of our unique culture, to our enduring faith in our own creativity and to our world leadership in artistic achievement.

From an economic point of view, the dollars sent by the Arts Endowment to communities around the Nation have been an extraordinarily successful investment. For every dollar the Endowment invests, there is created a tenfold return in jobs, services, and contracts. The arts fostered by the National Endowment encourage national and international tourism, attract and retain businesses in our communities, stimulate real estate development, increase production of exportable copyrighted materials and contribute to the tax base. Governors and mayors from around the country can attest to the manner in which Endowment-supported projects have breathed new life into the downtown areas of their towns and cities. New businesses and tourists congregate in those areas which have a developed cultural life. San Antonio, TX; Cleveland, OH; Greenville, MS;

Oklahoma City, OK; and Birmingham, AL are among the cities whose studies have shown the enormous economic contribution of the arts.

Mr. President, every parent knows that the arts are crucial in our school curricula because they teach young people creativity, increase self-discipline, and are a critical means of passing on an understanding of American culture and civilization to the next generation. Study of even a single artistic discipline is of immense value to a child, who may go on to become an avid amateur or patron. Last year, the Arts in Education Program distributed millions of dollars in partnership grants to the States to pay for artist residencies in schools and art teacher training.

I am most gratified that Chairman KASSEBAUM and Chairman JEFFORDS will be holding hearings over the next few weeks on authorization of the Endowments. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to share with those of us on the committee their concerns and ideas so that we can work together to shape the Endowment's future role in our society as effectively as possible. This tiny investment in our Nation's culture makes a statement to ourselves and to the world that we view the development of American culture and its availability to our citizens as of significant importance. We must not become the only Western industrialized nation to declare that our Government cares nothing for the development of our culture. National support for the arts fosters the creation of community—locally and on the national level. Regardless of our differences of wealth, race, religion, and political belief, our cultural development binds us together, develops our character as Americans, and establishes our common heritage. As President John F. Kennedy once said:

Art and the encouragement of art is political in the most profound sense, not as a weapon in the struggle, but as an instrument of understanding the futility of the struggle between those who share man's faith. Aeschylus and Plato are remembered today long after the triumphs of imperial Athens are gone. I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we too will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or politics, but for our contributions to the human spirit.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the